UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,480 07/11/2003 Arvind Kumar		Arvind Kumar	42P16125	5294
45209 INTEL/BSTZ	7590 09/26/200	EXAMINER		
BLAKELY SO	KOLOFF TAYLOR &	ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF		
	AD PARKWAY , CA 94085-4040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/26/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/618,480	KUMAR, ARVIND	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHAWKI S. ISMAIL	2155	

		SHAWKI S. ISWAIL	2133	
The MAILING DATE of th	is communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2008 F	AILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final re application, applicant must timely application in condition for allowator Continued Examination (RCE periods:</li> </ol>	y file one of the following rance; (2) a Notice of Appe	replies: (1) an amendment, affic eal (with appeal fee) in compliar	avit, or other evidence, vice with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) 🔲 The period for reply expires	months from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
no event, however, will the statu Examiner Note: If box 1 is check MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJE	itory period for reply expire la ked, check either box (a) or (l CTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	•	illing date of the final rejection THE FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. ILED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under have been filed is the date for purposes of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: ('set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any replymay reduce any earned patent term adjustr NOTICE OF APPEAL	determining the period of ext ) the expiration date of the s v received by the Office later	ension and the corresponding amore hortened statutory period for reply of the control of the con	unt of the fee. The appropri originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed o	n . A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must	be filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CI Notice of Appeal has been filed, AMENDMENTS	R 41.37(a)), or any exter	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) fil	ed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a br	ief, will <u>not</u> be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that			NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new	`	**		
(c) They are not deemed to pl	ace the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially	reducing or simplifying t	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional cla	aims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally	rejected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 C		orresponding number of finally	rejected cidims.	
4. The amendments are not in con		21 See attached Notice of Non-	Compliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome			Compliant / anonament (	1 102 02+).
6. Newly proposed or amended cla			te timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	anno) would be an	owabie ii subiiilled iii a separa	io, amory mod amoriamo	in dandeling the
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the prophow the new or amended claims</li> <li>The status of the claim(s) is (or very second to the claim in the claim i</li></ol>	would be rejected is prov		will be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> .				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONZ</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from conside	ration: <i>NONE</i> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence fi because applicant failed to provi was not earlier presented. See 3</li> </ol>	de a showing of good and			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence fi entered because the affidavit or showing a good and sufficient re</li> </ol>	other evidence failed to o	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under ap	peal and/or appellant fail	ls to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence	•	n of the status of the claims afte	r entry is below or attach	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION		L NOT L II II II II		
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	nas been considered but	does NOT place the application	n in condition for allowar	ice pecause:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>I</i></li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	_	
/saleh najjar/				
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art	Unit 2155			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues in substance that it is neither explicitly nor inherently disclosed in Horvitz to configure a plurality of automatic response email messages, each of the plurality of automatic response email messages tailored for a type of the incoming email messages. Thus, neither McCormick nor Horvitz disclose at least this limitation of claim 1. Therefore, given the deficiencies of McCormick and Horvitz, Applicant submits claims 1, 8 and 15 are not obvious. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Horvitz teaches that another functionality that can be provided is via an automated agent. For example, depending on the sender, the agent can respond with a recommendation about another channel or about changing the nature of the message (e.g., raising the message priority so it will page the user) along with the forecast on availability (e.g., "The user will not likely see your email for 4 hours; You may desire to try him at this number if it is very important; he will likely be available at this number in ... 30 minutes: 425-555-1212). In this example, it can be observed that forecasts about the time to availability of different modalities can be utilized together to help coordinate communications.

Horvitz further teaches a priorities messaging service may be provided wherein automated responses of return are generated based upon a predetermined urgency threshold associated with incoming messages above the urgency threshold. Additionally, the automated response can be tailored via a user configuration interface to send automated responses to messages that warrant some type of feedback from the user. User availability and expected return information may also be utilized to guide messaging decisions from automated messaging systems. For example, depending on an inferred or sensed urgency of a given message, and/or depending on who the sender or contactor is, and/or depending on combinations of urgency and the sender, and/or based upon the urgency threshold and the amount of time a user is expected to return to a message location, the message may be directed to a particular device such as a cell phone or pager instead of and/or in conjunction with an e-mail, for example, in order to facilitate that urgent messages have a better chance or reaching a desired party. Additionally, such times can be employed to automatically schedule future communications, such as real-time communications based on a forecast of when a user will have access to one or more modalities of communication. (Refer to Horvitz, paragraph [0013 and 0014]) Horvitz clearly teaches configuring a plurality of automatic response email messages, each of the plurality of automatic response email messages tailored for a type of the incoming email messages. Therefore, McCormick in view of Horvitz meets the scope of the claimed limitation and renders the claims obvious.